

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

KWAITEL JACKSON

PLAINTIFF

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:18-cv-181-SA-JMV

**CITY OF LELAND, LELAND POLICE DEPARTMENT;
MAYOR KENNY THOMAS, Individually and in his Official
Capacity; CHIEF BILLY BARBER, Individually and in his
Official Capacity; OFFICER COREY WEATHERSPOON,
Individually and in his Official Capacity, and
DEFENDANTS A-D**

DEFENDANTS

ORDER STAYING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(3)(B) provides that “a motion asserting an immunity defense... stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery, pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal. Whether to permit discovery on issues related to a motion... [is a decision] committed to the discretion of the court, upon a motion by any party seeking relief.” L.U. Civ. R. 16(b)(3)(B).

Defendants have filed three motions based on qualified immunity. [Docs. #6, 8, and 10]. Accordingly, staying discovery in this case is appropriate at this time.

If any party desires to take immunity-related discovery, they must file a motion for leave to do so within seven (7) days hereof, setting forth the type and scope of such discovery and an estimated time frame for constructing it. If any party objects to the motion for discovery, it shall file its objection within four (4) days following service of the motion for immunity-related discovery.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the aforementioned proceedings are hereby **STAYED** pending a ruling on the immunity motions. Defendants shall notify the undersigned magistrate judge within seven (7) days of a decision on the immunity motions and shall submit a proposed order lifting the stay.

SO ORDERED this, September 10, 2018.

/s/ Jane M. Virden

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE